RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER **2**001/003

APR 0 7 2004

OFFICIAL TO THE STATE OF THE ST

	()+	-
CERTIFICATE OF	TRANSMISSION	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by fax to the U.S. Patent and T 703-746-9694, on April, 2004.	rademark office to fax number	
Attorney for Applicant	,	

PATENT Docket No. DE920000017US1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Reinhold Geiselhart)
Scrial No.:	09/855,863)) Group Art) Unit: 2177
Filed:	May, 14, 2001	
For:	METHOD AND SYSTEM OF WEIGHTED CONTEXT FEEDBACK FOR RESULT IMPROVEMENT IN INFORMATION RETRIEVAL)

Examiner:

KUEN S LU

INTERVIEW AGENDA

Commissioner for Patents and Trademarks P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Examiner:

In anticipation of a telephone interview, Applicant respectfully submits this proposed agenda.

<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-7, 12-23, and 28-32 are pending in the case. The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 13-14, 17-18, and 29-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,933,822 to Braden-Harder (hereinafter "Braden-Harder") and U.S. Patent No. 6,473,751 to Nikolovska et al. (hereinafter "Nikolovska"). The Examiner rejected claims 3, 15, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Braden-Harder, Nikolovska, and U.S. Patent No. 5,675,819 to Schuetze (hereinafter "Schuetze"). The Examiner rejected claims 4-7, 9, 16, 20-23, and the various multiple dependent combinations under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Braden-Harder, Nikolovska, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0156763 to Marchisio (hereinafter "Marchisio"). The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Braden-Harder, Nikolovska, and U.S. Patent No. 6,014,664 to Fagin et al. (hereinafter "Fagin"). The Examiner rejected claims 1/2/3/6, 17/19/22 and 1/2/3/6/7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Braden-Harder, Nikolovska, Schuctze, and Marchisio.

"CONTEXT INFORMATION"

Applicant would like to discuss where in Braden-Harder or Nikolovska "context information" is taught or disclosed as recited in claim 1. Context is an adjective describing information. The term "Context" means "the parts of a discourse that surround a word or passage and can throw light on its meaning." See Merriam-Webster online dictionary at www.m-w.com. If the Examiner intends to equate "context information" and "logical forms" found in Braden-Harder Col. 5, lines 16-18, Applicant would like to know where this same teaching is found in Nikolovska in support of the Examiner's argument that Nikolovska teaches "presenting the context information to a user" as recited in claim 1.

"USER PREFERENCES"

Applicant would like to discuss where in Braden-Harder or Nikolovska "user preferences" are taught or disclosed in support of that arguments from the Examiner that Braden-Harder teaches "gathering user preferences for the context information" or "ranking the documents, based at least in part on the user preferences." as recited in claim 1.

04/07/2004 WED 3:03 FAX 801 531 1929 Kunzler and Associates

"INCONSISTENCIES"

If the Examiner intends to assert that Braden-Harder teaches "gathering user preferences for the context information" but not "presenting of context information to a user," Applicant would like to understand how such an inconsistent assertion is possible. Namely, how can two steps both involving users and context information be taught or described in two different references but not in either one together? How can user preferences for context information be gathered without being presented to a user?

In the event any questions or issues remain that can be resolved with a phone call, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate a telephone conference with the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

I professor

David J. McKenzie Reg. No. 46,919

Attorney for Applicants

Date: April 7, 2004 8 East Broadway, Suite 600 Salt Lake City, UT 84111 Telephone (801) 994-4646 Fax (801) 322-1054

Q:\tClient Piles\t1100 Silicon Valley\1129\POAR\1100.2.29 interview agenda.duc